

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 258

CS 208 420

AUTHOR Towers, Wayne M.
TITLE Some Uses-and-Gratifications of Television News Audiences.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Analysis; *Audiences; *Need Gratification; *News Reporting; Programing (Broadcast); Research Methodology; Television Research; *Television Viewing; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Television News

ABSTRACT

Fourteen statements relating to the surveillance, diversion, and social interaction uses of media were drawn from a review of uses and gratification research and applied to the viewing of local and national early evening news and nighttime local news television programs. A telephone survey of 543 adults elicited information concerning demographics and media usage, as well as reactions to the uses and gratifications statements. Overall, the results showed that the three types of newscasts served different purposes and that some of these differences were detectable through the uses and gratifications research perspective. Specifically, the findings showed that watching both local and national early evening news programs was related to surveillance of the environment while watching television in general was related to diversion from that environment. Watching local early evening news was also found to be related to diversion and acquiring materials for personal discussions, while watching early evening national news was more related to interaction with the larger social environment. Late night news was used primarily by viewers as a means of gathering information for social interaction or as a substitute for human companionship. (FL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS
OF TELEVISION NEWS AUDIENCES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

by

Wayne M. Towers, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
and
Acting Head of Advertising

Department of Journalism
San Diego State University
San Diego, California 92182

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wayne M. Towers

Telephone:

Home: (619) 582-5468

Office: (619) 265-6301
(619) 265-6635

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the Radio-Television Journalism Division,
Association for Education In Journalism and Mass Communication
Annual Convention, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida,
August 1984.

Abstract

SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS OF TELEVISION NEWS AUDIENCES

Using a telephone sample of 543 adults, the study applied fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements related to surveillance, diversion, and social interaction to the medium of television, and to local and national early evening news and nighttime local news programs.

Watching both local and national early evening news was found to be related to surveillance of the environment while watching television in general was found to be related to diversion from that environment. Local early evening news also was found to be related to diversion and acquiring materials for personal discussions. National early evening news was more related to interaction with the larger social environment. Late night news was distinguished from its earlier counterparts by being used primarily to gather materials for social interaction or as a substitute for human companionship. Overall, the study found that the three types of newscasts served different purposes and that some of these differences were detectable through the uses-and-gratifications research perspective.

SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS OF TELEVISION NEWS AUDIENCES

Since Katz and Foulkes' 1962 articulation of uses-and-gratifications as what people do with media rather than what media do to people,¹ research in that area has developed a lively tradition, particularly in regard to television audiences. The purpose of this paper will be to provide a thumbnail history of the uses-and-gratifications research perspective and its key insights, then to apply some of those insights in studying audiences for local and national television news in the early evening, and late night local news.

Brief history. Although several scattered uses-and-gratifications studies predated the 1970's, the quantitative side of uses-and-gratifications found much of its origin in Blumler and McQuail's 1969 study of the 1964 British parliamentary elections. In studying why Britons watched election broadcasts on the BBC, Blumler and McQuail chose the uses-and-gratifications perspective as a source of explanation for viewing a series of televised debates, finding a series of explanations including understanding the candidates, using information in arguments, and enjoying the excitement of the contest.¹ Overall, Blumler and McQuail were more interested in the election campaign than in the use of media as such, but the importance of media in the contest encouraged further research in the area of uses-and-gratifications.

The 1970's. The second seminal event in the brief history of uses-and-gratifications research was the 1974 publication of a compilation of studies in that area under the general editorship of Blumler and Katz.² Among the several important contributions contained within the

work was a study of the television habits of British school children by Greenberg, which detached uses-and-gratifications from political campaigns and stressed the medium of television itself. Greenberg interviewed the school children and used the statistical technique of factor analysis to identify underlying trends in the responses, which ranged from learning how to behave through just passing time.³

Greenberg's approaches and insights were replicated in the late 1970's by Rubin, who applied the British school children study to children in Illinois, and produced factor structures extremely similar to Greenberg's groupings.⁴ A key insight from Rubin's work was that although habit was strongly related to exposure to the medium of television, it was negatively related to exposure to news-public affairs programming.⁵ Using the same approach with adults, Rubin was able to produce similar findings, particularly in terms of habit relating to the amount of viewing.⁶

Simultaneously, Levy was studying adults in upstate New York in terms of both uses-and-gratifications and watching local television news.⁷ In terms of the television medium, Levy found factor analytic groups of statements ranging from events with a personal reference and opinion formation to novelty and escape from daily life, but concluded little difference existed between active and passive tuning into the news, and that channel watched was a strong predictor of local news watched.⁸ These findings shifted Levy's subsequent research to focus on news performance, comparing what audiences perceived themselves as expecting from the local television news against what they felt they actually received.⁹

The decade of the 1970's concluded with the third seminal publication within the brief history of uses-and-gratifications research, an issue of the journal Communication Research edited by Swanson and devoted to the uses-and-gratifications approach.¹⁰ In that issue, Blumler addressed the history of uses-and-gratifications research and argued that most findings could be divided into three broad conceptual areas: (1) surveillance of the surrounding environment for relevant information; (2) diversion from the surrounding environment for escape and relaxation; and, (3) personal identity, developed through interaction with the surrounding environment, ranging from developing self-perceptions to interpersonal contact with others. Blumler reproduced his insights quantitatively using a sample of British adults, but found a fourth set of results related to curiosity about the environment as well.¹¹

Within the same journal issue, Becker used samples of adults in upstate New York and Wisconsin, and reproduced Blumler's three broad areas, as well as a fourth area related to whether or not voters had made up their minds in an election.¹² Overall, the findings were highly similar, but the deviations were sufficiently noteworthy to encourage further expansion of the uses-and-gratifications literature. During the 1970's, uses-and-gratifications research had moved from a contribution in a study of political campaigns to an approach to generating insights concerning why people expose themselves to mass media like television.

The 1980's. The dominant characteristic of uses-and-gratifications research in the early 1980's has been the expansion of efforts and interested scholars in the area. To date, uses-and-gratifications

in the 1980's has involved one programmatic approach, and several single contributions of replications in a wide range of topics.

The single programmatic approach has been the varied efforts of Palmgreen, Rayburn, and Wenner in distinguishing between the gratifications sought from a medium like television and obtained from that medium's programming. Drawing on a 1977 study by Lometti, Bybee, and Reeves that distinguished print from electronic media use through the uses-and-gratifications research perspective,¹³ Palmgreen, Rayburn and Wenner studied Kentucky adults to determine if public television viewers could be distinguished from non-viewers in terms of seeking gratifications from the television medium and obtaining those gratifications from programming, particularly public television programming.¹⁴ Encouraged by the results, the three researchers shifted their attention to television network evening news and learned that gratifications sought and obtained from those programs were similar, featuring surveillance concepts like seeking information for general use or for decisions; diversion statements like finding exciting, dramatic and entertaining news; and, interaction statements like finding things to talk about and using television as a substitute for companionship with other people.¹⁵ Influenced by Galloway and Meek's research on Australian college students' perceptions of discrepancies between what they seek and obtain from media,¹⁶ this particular research program has shifted to using the amounts of discrepancy between gratifications sought and obtained as a technique for explaining media use,¹⁷ sparking a lively debate about the approach's algebraic and conceptual soundness.¹⁸ Overall,

however, the key contribution of Palmgreen, Rayburn, and Wenner has been their linkage of uses-and-gratifications to network news watching, and their replication of Blumler's three key areas of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, as well as their replication of additional factors that did not fit the first three groupings.

Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn have not been alone in their efforts in this regard during the 1980's. The concept of gratifications sought from the medium and obtained from the programs of television has been explored by other scholars as well. Cutler and Danowski studied media use by the elderly and found that increased use of television by the elderly was related to increased use of the medium as a process for seeking gratifications, while interest in obtaining content from the programs declined simultaneously.¹⁹ This finding meant that the elderly were influenced by the medium of television itself rather than by its content. Bantz studied Midwestern undergraduates and replicated the notions of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, as well as the unique grouping of voyeurism, watching programming for its sex appeal.²⁰ Finally, Levy and Windahl studied Swedish adults and produced the surveillance-diversion-interaction triad for watching television news.²¹ In general, research in this area has reproduced Blumler's triad and applied the basic distinctions with reasonable success to viewing television news, particularly national news.

In addition to the broad 1980's trend of comparing the television medium with its programming, the 1980's also have seen a continuation of the 1970's emphasis on the medium itself. Kippax and Murray studied

Australian adults and produced Blumler's three groupings as well as a fourth idiosyncratic grouping related to having a happy family life.²² Additionally, Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld studied Southwestern undergraduates and found television related to the basic surveillance ideas of information about daily living and keeping up with the government as well as the diversion ideas of being entertained and killing time. The study did not produce a interaction factor, treating interaction with friends as a communication variable in its own right.²³ Overall, the research of the 1980's reinforced the strength of Blumler's triad and added the insight that gratifications related to exposure to the television medium itself could be somewhat different than gratifications related to programming within that medium.

This study. Based on the findings of the 1970's and 1980's, this study took part of both the medium only tradition of the 1970's and the medium-content approach and combined them. The basic insight of the 1970's was that Blumler's triad of surveillance, diversion, and entertainment could be applied to the general medium of television. Accordingly, the study hypothesized that this insight could be replicated:

H₁: Reasons for watching the medium of television will fall within the three broad groupings of surveillance, diversion, and interaction.

Additionally, the study also sought to build on the basic insight of the early 1980's that the uses-and-gratifications statements used in these various studies could be used to explain television news watching, with stronger orientations toward each of the three gratification groups of surveillance, diversion, and interaction predicting the watching

of television news. Accordingly, the study also hypothesized:

H₂: Watching television news will be related to stronger orientations toward surveillance, diversion, and interaction.

Finally, the study attempted to add to knowledge in the uses-and-gratifications area by examining the question of whether watching the different types of television news could be explained by the uses-and-gratifications perspective. The 1970's research focused on local news and the 1980's research focused on national news, but neither group focused on the late night news and on any differences among early evening local news, early evening national news, and late night local news on television. Accordingly, the study's third, and final, hypothesis examined whether such a distinction existed:

H₃: Different combinations of surveillance, diversion, and interaction will be related to watching early evening local news, early evening national news, and late night local news.

Past research has distinguished between watchers and non-watchers of news, this study will add the focus of distinguishing between viewers of the different types of news programs as well.

Method.

During Fall 1981, a telephone survey of 543 adults was conducted in a large urban area of the Western United States. Questions were asked concerning demographics, media usage, and reactions to a selection of uses-and-gratifications statements. Interviews were conducted by trained undergraduates enrolled in an advanced research methods class, and each completed interview was verified through a second telephone call by

different students in another course. Additionally, planted numbers were assigned to both groups to verify that they were using the assigned numbers and accurately attempting the calls.

Because of space and time limitations, fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements were selected from the five uses-and-studies gratifications published in U.S. scholarly journals during the two years prior to the survey that dealt specifically with media use rather than media use in election campaigns.²⁴ The statements were selected if they loaded highest on a factor conceptually matching Blumler's triad of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, and if they were appropriate for a U.S. respondent. Additionally, some idiosyncratic statements also were selected from the five studies to determine if the study could replicate the factor structure of Blumler's three key groupings plus a fourth idiosyncratic factor. The statements were reworded for content and grammatical consistency and presented so that respondents could reply on a five point scale of: strongly agree/agree/neutral-no opinion/disagree/strongly disagree.

The fourteen statements used were:

Surveillance:

1. Get immediate knowledge of big news events.
2. Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community.
3. Understand what is going on.
4. Find issues affecting people like myself.

Diversion:

5. Just pass the time.
6. Be entertained.

Diversion (continued):

7. Get dramatic, exciting and entertaining news.
8. Be happy.

Interaction:

9. By being my friend when I am alone.
10. Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others.
11. Improve the quality of my lifestyle.
12. Get information to pass on to other people.

Idiosyncratic:

13. Find products through advertisements.
14. Get information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents.

All fourteen statements were asked for each of the major mass media of television, radio, newspaper, and magazine. Because of time and space strictures, the 1980's approach of asking the same statements in relation to particular news programs could not be used. Instead, differences among news watchers were developed statistically, using their reports concerning whether or not they had watched the early or late local news, or the network early evening news during the past week.

After verification, the completed questionnaires were coded and keypunched, then analyzed using version 8.3 of SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The replies to the uses-and-gratifications statements were coded from five for strongly agree down to one for strongly disagree. This coding approximated interval data for the analysis, and meant that higher means indicated stronger

agreement with the statements, lower means meant greater disagreement.

Results.

Analysis of the data consisted of two parts: first, establishing that the underlying concepts of surveillance, diversion, and interaction were present in the data; and, second, applying those statements to television news viewing itself. For the first goal, television was examined as a medium; for the second goal, television news viewing behaviors were added as controls for further exploration.

First goal. The analysis of television as a medium followed the standard practice among uses-and-gratifications researchers of using factor analysis to detect underlying relations among statements through statistical techniques. Table 1 shows the solution of a principal components, varimax orthogonal rotation factor analysis for the fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements in this study.

Table 1

As Table 1 indicates, three factor groupings interpretable as surveillance, diversion, and interaction did emerge, although not all of the statements loaded on the factors that were presented in the literature.

The first factor was an interaction factor, incorporating expected statements like "Get information to pass along to other people" and "Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others." In addition to these two statements with the strongest relation to the factor, several conceptually unrelated statements also loaded on the first factor: the idiosyncratic statements of "Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or

accidents" and "Find products through advertisements;" the diversion statement of "Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news;" and, the surveillance statements of "Understand what is going on" and "Get immediate knowledge of big news events." From a technical perspective, these findings meant that interaction was the prime concept identified by the factor, but that it was not technically pure because other statements were related as well. Conceptually, however, these findings meant that although interaction was the dominant notion for the factor, the ideas of surveillance and diversion were related to interaction. Interaction was not an either interaction or not-interaction concept; rather it was a concept of degree, emphasizing interaction but related to some extent to surveillance and diversion as well. Overall, on the strength of the loading of the first two statements, factor one will be called interaction.

The second factor in Table 1 corresponded to diversion. Three of the four statements loading on this factor grouping were diversion statements: "Be happy;" "Just pass the time;" and, "Be entertained." The fourth statement, "By being my friend when I am alone," came from the interaction statements, but again, the dominant thrust of the factor grouping was toward diversion. Factor 2 will be called diversion, with the acknowledgment that it also showed some relation to Blumler's other concepts.

Finally, the third factor in Table 1 reflected an surveillance concept, based on the loading of "Find issues affecting people like myself" and "Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community" on it.

Again, the factor was not technically pure because the interaction statement "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" also loaded on it. Again, the higher loadings of the two surveillance statements argued that the factor was mainly surveillance-oriented but that surveillance was not totally independent of the other concepts in Blumler's triad.

Overall, the factor analytic solution presented in Table 1 supported Hypothesis 1's assertion that Blumler's triad would underlie the statements used. From a technical viewpoint, the statements used were not sufficiently distinctive to separate all three concepts cleanly, but from a conceptual viewpoint, these concepts could be highly intercorrelated as part of a generalized notion of media evaluation within the population, and so the intercorrelation would reflect the concept that the triad of surveillance, diversion, and interaction are related synergistically rather than trichotomously. In any case, the emergence of the three factor groups justified accepting Hypothesis 1, but the factor analytic reclassification of some statements found in the literature meant that subsequent discussions of the study's data set should reflect the factor analytic groupings rather than the literature groupings. Accordingly, when the study makes subsequent use of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, it will refer to the factor analytic groupings, and not the literature based groupings from the section on methodology.

Second goal. To meet the second goal of distinguishing among watchers of local evening news, network evening news, and local late night news, the study needed to distinguish between watching the

medium of television itself and watching the three types of news within that medium. To accomplish this goal, the study first considered the medium itself, then examined each of the three types of news program in terms of its audience. Since the replies to the uses-and-gratifications statements approximated interval data and since reports of watching or not watching a television program or programs was essentially nominal, the study used the technique of discriminant analysis,²⁵ with the statements serving as the independent or predictor variables, and with the television viewing behaviors serving as the dependent or criterion variables.

Table 2

Table 2 shows the discriminant analysis of the relation between the fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements and the dependent variable distinction of the number of hours of television viewed between 6PM and midnight. The 6PM-12:00M time frame was used because focus groups prior to the survey indicated that the respondents built their day around mealtimes rather than broadcast dayparts, with 6PM being an acceptable time to start the evening at home with supper. Additionally, at the time of the survey, the network-affiliated television stations in the area studied did not start their newblock until 6PM and did not extend it beyond 7PM for the early evening news.

Hours of television viewing were examined first so that a baseline could be established against which subsequent analyses of news viewing could be compared. If the medium and the programs had the same profile, then newsviewing would be a function of televiewing; but if the

profiles differed, then different television viewing behavior would be based on different sets of statements.

Examination of Table 2 indicated that heavy viewers, watching three (+0.35) or four or more hours (+0.39) of television during the six hours of the 6PM to midnight evening time slot were different from light viewers, who watched zero (-0.19); one (-0.47); or, two (-0.24) hours of television on the average weeknight.

The first column of Table 2 shows the statements that produced the statistically best relationship between the uses-and-gratifications statements and the hours of television watched. The relative strength of these relations is shown by the discriminant functions, which are shown down the second column for the statements and across the rows for the hours watched. The positive functions for watching three or more hours of television and the diversion statements of "Be happy" and "Just pass the time" indicated that heavy television viewing was strongly associated being entertained by the medium. The negative functions for watching two hours or less on the average weekday matched up weakly with "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" (-0.23), indicating more generalized relations toward the statements among the light viewers. Please note that the positive and negative signs do not have any conceptual meaning; they are simply technical indicators of differing relationships.

Overall, the discriminant analysis of Table 2 indicated that heavy viewers of television were distinguished from lighter viewers and non-viewers, by the strong diversion orientation of the heavy viewers. Because discriminant functions are often difficult to

interpret intuitively, the third through seventh columns of Table 2 show the mean replies to the gratifications statements for each level of hours of viewing. For example, the diversion statement "Be happy" was more strongly endorsed by the heavy three (mean=3.19) and four or more hours (mean=3.12) viewers than by the lighter viewers of two (2.75), one (2.55) or zero (2.84) hours. These consistencies reinforce the notion that heavy viewers were more strongly oriented toward diversion than were the lighter viewers in Table 2.

Table 3

Given the baseline notion that heavier viewers were more strongly diversion-oriented than were light viewers, the study next examined the three types of television news programs available on a daily basis to the respondents: the early evening local news, the early evening national news, and the late night local news. Table 3 shows the uses-and-gratifications statements that were selected as the statistically most predictive of watching or not watching the early evening local news, which usually aired at 6PM.

Examination of Table 3 indicated that the surveillance statement of "Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community" was the strongest predictor of watching local news. This finding meant that local news watchers were different from television both heavy and light television watchers, and that they were oriented toward being informed about their locality. This strong surveillance was followed by the diversion statements of "Just pass the time" and "Be happy," which would be expected to be the contribution of the heavy viewers watching the news because it is on at the time.

Further examination of Table 3 indicated that non-watchers of the local early evening news endorsed the diversion statement of "Be entertained." This endorsement probably reflected the view that television was an entertainment medium for them, but that they did not find the news entertaining, and so tended not to watch. Overall, Table 3 indicated that local television news watchers were strongly motivated by surveillance of local issues, with healthy side orders of diversion and interaction thrown into their viewing motives.

Table 4

Table 4 shows the relation between the uses-and-gratifications statements and watching the network early evening news. Again, the surveillance statement of "Keep informed about what is happening in my local community" was the strongest predictor of viewing. Although the local slant of the question may appear absurd in the context of network news, the strength of this statement probably reflects two basic concepts. First, the "Keep informed" part of the statement could have been more compelling to the respondents than the "local community" because they were replying in the context of television in general rather than in the context of local versus network news. Second, particularly since the area studied was strongly dependent upon military bases in its local economy, national news, particularly as it involved the military, would be important in a local context. By and large, the surveillance part of the concept was probably more important than the geographic part.

Further examination of Table 4 brought a shift from diversion as the second strongest statement for local news to interaction as

the second strongest statement for network news. In Table 4, the second strongest endorsement went to the two interaction statements of "Get immediate knowledge of big news events" and "Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news." In the context of the study, these statements probably reflected an active interest and involvement in the news of the day, an inclusion of the news in the general context of the viewers' lives.

This contextual viewpoint was reinforced by the strong endorsement of the interactive "Find issues affecting people like myself" by the non-watchers of network news in Table 4. This endorsement meant that the non-watchers wanted news of personal relevance, and they did not share the watchers' generalized sense of interaction with the broader events of the day. The non-watchers wanted news they could use, and, if such was not available, preferred to "Be entertained," their second strongest selection.

Taken together, Tables 3 and 4 point to the notion that the television evening newscast will be watched for surveillance of the news environment. Local news will attract heavy viewers of television who are strongly diversion-oriented, while network news showed as more attractive to feelings of interaction with the broader news environment. Non-watchers tended to view television as an entertainment medium, not finding the news entertaining unless it reported on issues specifically affecting them. Overall, these findings meant that local and national news in the early evening newscast were related to different gratification statements and that the distinctions were conceptually useful. The fineness of the distinctions, however,

also highlighted the notion that surveillance, diversion, and interaction are highly intercorrelated within the viewing audiences and that only small differences can be teased out by comparing them.

Table 5

As a crosscheck on Tables 3 and 4's examination of early evening newswatching, the study also compared the fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements and the late night local news, which usually began at 11:00 PM in the area studied. Again, if the program was important to watching, then the expectation was that viewers would produce results different from generalized telewatching. Also, if watching the late news required different viewing motivations from watching the early news, the results would be different from viewing the early evening news programs as well.

Examination of Table 5 showed that the statistically strongest statement was the interactive "Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others." This finding meant that the late night news was viewed as a source of materials for potential discussions, probably during the next day. The second strongest reason was companionship as reflected in the diversion statement of "By being my friend when I am alone." This statement meant that late night viewing was used as a substitute for human companionship called parasocial interaction, and meant that the garrulous and the isolated were the likely late night audience. Non-viewers were not particularly interested in the late news, endorsing the conceptually meaningless idiosyncratic phrase of "Find products through advertisements" as their technically strongest reason.

Overall, the findings of Tables 3,4, and 5 meant that viewing television news was different from general consumption of the television medium. General consumption of television was related to diversion concepts, while watching the early evening news was related to surveillance, with passing the time an important secondary reason for local news and interaction with the news environment important for national news. Late night news was distinct from both general viewing of television and the early evening news in its stress on providing something to talk about and providing nighttime companionship for the lonely.

Conclusions.

In terms of the hypotheses, the first hypothesis concerning Blumler's triad of surveillance, diversion, and interaction was supported, but with reservations. Although the three concepts could be extracted from the data, they were so interrelated that marginal differences at best could be extracted. This intercorrelation also probably accounts for the instability of the results in uses-and-gratifications research. The concepts are so intertwined that only small differences can be teased out, and those differences would tend to vary somewhat based upon differences in time, location, and technique of study. The bottom line, however, was that the concepts of surveillance, diversion, and interaction were sufficiently stable to encourage their use in studying television news watching behaviors.

In terms of Hypothesis 2's assertion that television news watching would be related to stronger orientations toward surveillance,

diversion, and interaction, the support emerged but not with undisputed clarity. Surveillance strongly predicted early evening news watching, diversion was a strongly secondary reason for local evening news watching, and interaction was strong for late night local news. Taken together, these findings strongly reinforce the notion that Blumler's triad of concepts reflect high intercorrelation and that only small and highly contingent differences can be teased from the data. Overall, the findings support Hypothesis Two assertions, but only with the caveat that the differences are directional not dichotomous.

Finally, the third hypothesis asserted that early and late local news and network evening news could be distinguished from each other using the uses-and-gratifications statements. Although both local and national evening news were most strongly related to surveillance, the strong secondary reasons of diversion for local and interaction for national news demonstrated that distinctions could be developed. Further, the strong endorsement of interaction for the late night local news also supported distinctions among the three newscasts.

Taken as a whole, the study supported the viability of uses-and-gratifications as an explanation of audience viewing habits. However, the complexity of the findings indicated that more development will be needed in the area of measurement to separate the highly related concepts of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, and that any media-based analysis will need to account for the properties of the medium itself as well as of the content within that media. Uses-and-gratifications has come far in its brief history; it still has far to go.

¹ Elihu Katz and David Foulkes, "On the Use of Mass Media as 'Escape': the Clarification of a Concept." Public Opinion Quarterly 26: 377-388 (1962).

^{1a} Jay G. Blumler and Denis McQuail, Television in Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 31; 75-76; 80.

² Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz, eds., The Uses of Mass Communications (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974), passim.

³ Bradley S. Greenberg, "Gratifications of Television Viewing and Their Correlates for British Children," pp. 71-92 in Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz, eds., The Uses of Mass Communications (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974), pp. 76; 91.

⁴ Alan M. Rubin, "Television Usage, Attitudes and Viewing Behaviors," Journal of Broadcasting 21: 355-369 (1977).

⁵ Alan M. Rubin, "Television Use by Children and Adolescents," Human Communication Research 5: 109-120 (1979).

⁶ Alan M. Rubin, "An Examination of Television Viewing Motivations," Communication Research 8: 141-165 (1981).

⁷ Mark R. Levy, "Experiencing Television News," Journal of Communication 27: 112-117 (1977).

⁸ Mark R. Levy, "The Audience Experience with Television News," Journalism Monographs 55:1-29 (1978).

⁹ Mark R. Levy and Sven Windahl, "Audience Activity and Gratifications: A Conceptual Clarification and Exploration," Communication Research 11: 51-78 (1984).

- 10 David L. Swanson, ed., "The Uses and Gratifications Approach to Mass Communications Research," Communication Research 6: 1-112 (1979).
- 11 Jay G. Blumler, "The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratifications Studies," Communication Research 6: 9-36 (1979).
- 12 Lee B. Becker, "Measurement of Gratifications," Communication Research 6: 54-73 (1979).
- 13 Guy E. Lometti, Byron Reeves, and Carl R. Bybee, "Investigating the Assumptions of Uses and Gratifications Research," Communication Research 4: 32-338 (1977).
- 14 Philip Palmgreen, Lawrence A. Wenner, and J. D. Rayburn II. "Uses and Gratifications and Exposure to Public Television: A Discrepancy Approach," Communication Research 6: 155-180 (1979);
- 15 Philip Palmgreen, Lawrence A. Wenner, and J.D. Rayburn II. "Relations between Gratifications Sought and Obtained: A Study of Television News," Communication Research 7: 161-192 (1980);
Philip Palmgreen, Lawrence A. Wenner, and J.D. Rayburn II. "Gratification Discrepancies and Program Choice," Communication Research 8: 451-478; Lawrence A. Wenner, "Gratifications Sought and Obtained in Program Dependency: A Study of Network Evening News and 60 Minutes," Communication Research 9: 539-560 (1982).
- 16 John J. Galloway and F. Louise Meek, "Audience Uses and Gratifications; An Expectancy Model," Communication Research 8: 435-449.

- 17 Philip Palmgreen and J. D. Rayburn II. "Gratifications Sought and Media Exposure: An Expectancy Value Model," Communication Research 9: 561-580 (1982).
- 18 Serena W. Stanford, "Comment on Palmgreen and Rayburn, 'Gratifications Sought and Media Exposure'," Communication Research 10: 247-251 (1983); Philip Palmgreen and J. D. Rayburn II, "A Response to Stanford," Communication Research 10: 253-257 (1983).
- 19 Neal E. Cutler and James A. Danowski, "Process Gratification in Aging Cohorts," Journalism Quarterly 57: 269-276 (1980).
- 20 Charles R. Bantz, "Exploring Uses and Gratifications: A Comparison of Reported Uses of Television and Reported Uses of Favorite Program Type," Communication Research 9: 352-379 (1982).
- 21 Levy and Windahl, "Audience Activity and Gratifications: A Conceptual Classification and Exploration," op. cit.
- 22 Susan Kippax and John P. Murray, "Using the Mass Media: Need Gratifications and Perceived Utility," Communication Research 7: 355-380 (1980).
- 23 Allen Lichtenstein and Lawrence B. Rosenfeld, "Uses and Misuses of Gratifications Research: An Explication of Media Function," Communication Research 10: 97-109 (1983).
- 24 Becker, "Measurement of Gratifications," op. cit.; Blumler, "The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratifications Studies," op. cit.; Judee K. Burgoon and Michael Burgoon, "The Functions of the Daily Newspaper," Newspaper Research Journal 2: 29-39 (1981); Kippax and

Murray, "Using the Mass Media: Need Gratifications and Perceived Utility," op. cit.; Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn, "Uses and Gratifications and Exposure to Public Television: A Discrepancy Approach," op. cit.

²⁵ William R. Klecka, "Discriminant Analysis," pp. 434-467 in SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, ed. by Norman Nie et al. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

²⁶ Donald Horton and R. Richard Wohl, "Mass Communication as Para-Social Interaction," Psychiatry 19: 215-229 (1956); Levy, "The Audience Experience with Television News," op. cit.; Levy and Windahl, "Audience Activity and Gratifications: A Conceptual Clarification and Exploration," op. cit.

#

Table 1

Factor Analysis of Uses-and-Gratifications Statements
Applied to Television

	FACTORS			(Estimated Communality)
	I	II	III	
<u>Interaction Statements:</u>				
Get information to pass along to other people	<u>0.60</u>	0.19	0.31	(0.43)
Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others	<u>0.56</u>	0.25	0.19	(0.38)
Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents	<u>0.50</u>	0.11	0.16	(0.24)
Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news	<u>0.50</u>	0.16	0.26	(0.29)
Understand what is going on	<u>0.45</u>	0.08	0.39	(0.30)
Find products through advertisements	<u>0.44</u>	0.19	0.05	(0.17)
Get immediate knowledge of big news events	<u>0.38</u>	0.02	0.38	(0.26)
<u>Diversion Statements:</u>				
Be happy	0.08	<u>0.66</u>	0.16	(0.32)
Just pass the time	0.08	<u>0.59</u>	-0.03	(0.26)
By being my friend when I am alone	0.18	<u>0.56</u>	0.16	(0.16)
Be entertained	0.22	<u>0.53</u>	0.01	(0.25)
<u>Surveillance Statements:</u>				
Find issues affecting people like myself	0.17	0.08	<u>0.62</u>	(0.24)
Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community	0.36	0.02	<u>0.46</u>	(0.28)
Improve the quality of my lifestyle	0.17	0.35	<u>0.41</u>	(0.27)
Eigenvalue(s):	4.20	1.68	1.04	----
Percent of variance:	32.6%	12.4%	7.5%	----
Cumulative percent:	32.6%	42.0%	49.4%	----

Table 2

Mean Replies to Key Uses-and-Gratifications Statements
for Hours Watched TV after 6PM

<u>Hours watched TV:</u>		DEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)				
		Four or more	Three	Two	One	Zero
		(+0.39)	(+0.35)	(-0.24)	(-0.47)	(-0.19)
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant functions in parentheses)						
Be happy	(+0.62)	<u>3.19</u>	<u>3.12</u>	2.75	2.55	2.84
Just pass the time	(+0.42)	<u>3.58</u>	<u>3.56</u>	3.24	2.97	3.25
Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents	(+0.24)	3.89	3.56	3.72	3.74	3.98
Find issues affecting people like myself	(+0.18)	3.77	3.60	3.33	3.73	3.54
Find interesting or unusual stories to tell others	(+0.14)	3.67	3.45	3.33	3.50	3.20
Improve the quality of my lifestyle	(-0.23)	3.07	2.76	2.78	2.79	2.68
Percent of respondents: (N=460)		18.3%	25.4%	28.9%	14.6%	12.8%

Eigenvalue = 0.11; canonical correlation = 0.32

Wilks' lambda = 0.82; Chi-square goodness-of-fit = 87.0; df = 16; $p \leq 0.01$

Percent correctly classified = 31.96 (prior probability = 20%)

Table 3

Mean Replies to Key Uses-and-Gratifications Statements
for Watched Early Evening Local TV News

		DEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)	
		Watched	Not Watched
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)		(+0.20)	(-0.31)
Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community	(+0.71)	<u>3.96</u>	3.66
Just pass the time	(+0.45)	<u>3.41</u>	3.25
Be happy	(+0.32)	<u>3.79</u>	3.65
Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others	(+0.29)	<u>3.48</u>	3.34
Be entertained	(-0.65)	3.68	<u>3.83</u>
Get information to pass along to other people	(-0.39)	3.53	3.53
Percent of respondents: (N=543)		<u>60.2%</u>	<u>39.8%</u>

Eigenvalue = 0.06; Canonical correlation = 0.24

Wilks' lambda = 0.94; Chi-square goodness-of-fit = 32.5; df = 6; $p \leq 0.01$

Percent correctly classified = 61.88 (prior probability = 50%)

Table 4

Mean Replies to Key Uses-and-Gratifications Statements
for Watched Evening National Network TV News

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)		DEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)	
		Watched	Not Watched
Keep informed about what is happening in my local community	(+0.60)	(+0.29) <u>4.00</u>	(-0.15) 3.75
Get immediate knowledge of big news events	(+0.50)	<u>4.14</u>	3.96
Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news	(+0.47)	<u>3.61</u>	3.39
Find issues affecting people like myself	(-0.44)	3.52	<u>3.56</u>
Be entertained	(-0.37)	3.70	<u>3.77</u>
Get information to pass along to other people	(-0.29)	3.53	3.53
Percent of respondents: (N=543)		<u>33.9%</u>	<u>66.1%</u>

Eigenvalue = 0.04; Canonical correlation = 0.21

Wilks' lambda = 0.96; Chi-square goodness-of-fit = 23.4; df = 6; $p \leq 0.01$

Percent correctly classified = 59.48 (prior probability = 50%)

Table 5

Mean Replies to Key Uses-and-Gratifications Statements
for Watched Late Night Local TV News

		DEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)	
		Watched	Not Watched
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: (Discriminant Functions in Parentheses)		(+0.22)	(-0.13)
Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others	(+0.69)	<u>3.58</u>	3.33
By being my friend when I am alone	(+0.59)	<u>3.18</u>	2.92
Find issues affecting people like myself	(+0.27)	<u>3.64</u>	3.49
Find products through advertisements	(-0.43)	3.26	<u>3.30</u>
Percent of respondents:		<u>37.8%</u>	<u>62.2%</u>

Eigenvalue = 0.03; Canonical correlation = 0.17

Wilks' lambda = 0.97; Chi-square goodness-of-fit = 15.7; df = 4; $p \leq 0.01$

Percent correctly classified = 55.06 (prior probability = 50%)